

Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-I203-1

Short Proposal Title: Partnership in Environmental Ed

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes – project extends Environmental Education opportunities for students and teachers to gain some level of awareness and knowledge of San Joaquin Valley issues.

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Does not address how the new curriculum and field trip experiences are tied to current education reform and useful to both students and teachers.

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Money to support staff and site development.

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Poor – have salmonids in the classroom been evaluated? Is this a valuable program both ecologically and educationally – does anyone know?

1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Only if CALFED supported programs are networked! Too many isolated efforts --

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Not applicable.

2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Not applicable.

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes – but does it address what is being done at schools – is there an educational need to be met? CALFED educational goals = California educational goals? How does this project balance this reality?

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes – but what teachers are involved? Are they qualified?

Miscellaneous comments

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Overview:

This proposal includes the development of a regional curriculum, teacher workshops and field trip opportunities in the San Joaquin River valley. The program would build upon existing outreach efforts of the three collaborators. The request also provides for acquisition of field trip support materials (picnic tables, shelters and chemical toilets).

Positive Aspects:

- Allows for three organizations to pool resources in a collaborative project
- Extends additional opportunities for students and teachers to gain awareness and some knowledge of the San Joaquin Valley water issues
- Allows for the development of a regionalized version of existing curriculum (Salmonids in the Classroom)
- Letters of support from collaborators.

Negative Aspects:

- Does not address how the curriculum and field trip experiences are tied to current educational reforms and standards and therefore may not be useful to teachers
- Provides funds for site development (tables, shelters, toilets) rather than advancing environmental education goals.
- Most of the funds requested are allocations for staff rather than providing funding for schools to go on field trips which is the greatest barrier for schools to take advantage of programs offered by agencies and organizations.

Reviewer's comments:

Although the proponents of this proposal indicate considerable outreach to regional teachers and implementation of an existing curriculum and field trips, it is not clear how additional staff/docents will benefit the *increased understanding of watershed ecology by an undefined number of additional teachers and students*. What would be the scope of an additional curriculum that is not currently being met by the "Salmonids in the Classroom" program? How are the field trip opportunities offered by the partners currently tied into the existing and the proposed curricula? What is the scope of the teacher/parent training?

Furthermore, how would this partnership be benefited by the project described below? Are they interconnected with any of the other proposals that call for curriculum development and could be used adopted by others?

**Overall Evaluation
Summary Rating**

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Very Good
- ☐ Good
- ☒ Fair
- ☐ Poor

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]
